STILL ANOTHER "MONA LISA" DISCOVERED IN ENGLAND

The "Mona Lisa" recently discovered at Isleworth, Middlesex, England.

It Is Different From the Painting Just Returned to the Louvre in Paris and in Some Respects It More Closely Resembles Accounts of Leonardo da Vinci's Original Work

A NEW and different version of the "Mona Lisa" by Leonardo da Vinci has been discovered in the possession of Mr. Eyre, author and novelist, of Isleworth, Middlesex, England. It varies considerably from the Louvre version and shows the columns on either side, as mentioned by Vasari, the historian of Italian art.

These columns are also shown in a drawing by Raphael of the "Mona Lisa" of which Muntz gives a whole page illustration in his authoritative biography of Da Vinci. Regarding these columns he says: "One detail which has been overlooked is that the portrait is enframed by two beautiful painted columns; these are hidden by the frame."

This statement as to the presence of the columns is incorrect, as the old copy belonging to Richardson, which was compared with the Louvre picture in 1750 at Coypel's house in Paris and was identical with the Louvre picture in every particular, is without the columns. The only existing "Mona Lisa" in the world showing the columns and with the unfinished background is declared to be the one at Isleworth.

The trees to the left of the Isleworth picture are also indicated in Raphael's drawing of Leonardo's original, apparently done from memory. This drawing is in the Louvre.

This new work is pronounced to be contemporary with the Louvre picture. It is much larger and already there are critics who say that it even has claims for serious consideration as the original masterpiece of Leonardo. The owner, however, is content that the work shall be judged on its own merits, but holds that it is intrinsically a more beautiful work of art than the famous Paris picture.

The painting was at some time or other transferred from panel to canvas. In size it is 3½ inches higher and 5 inches wider than the Paris picture, and on each side a column runs up, as mentioned in contemporary descriptions of the picture. The background is entirely different and unfinished—again substantiating the statement made by Vasari that the background was never completed.

The head is tilted more forward and the setting of the hair is exactly in the centre, while that of the Louvre picture is in the middle of the forehead and runs to the back of the head at an impossible and incorrect angle.

The quality of the picture is darker and the coloring, as in almost all the works attributed to Leonardo, has a golden glow. The finish is of the most delicate character.

The Louvre picture, whether from cleaning or any other cause, shows a large hole over the left eye which is anatomically impossible, a blemish which is absent in the new version, while the line of the jaw is not cut in so suddenly against the chin.

The drapery which falls over the left shoulder is hardly indicated against the left of the breast, thus differing from the Louvre picture. The hands appear more delicate and perfect in drawing.

The picture is of such interest that it is as well to quote certain authorities who refer to incidents in Leonardo's working life. Muntz says (Vol. II., page 153): "As early as 1501 Fra Pietro da Nuvolaria reports in one of his letters to the Marchesa Isabella d'Este that two of Leonardo's pupils were painting portraits which he occasionally worked upon himself." Also: "It is scarcely probable that the portrait of 'Mona Lisa' was the female portrait ordered by Giuliand de Medici and seen in Leonardo's studio by Cardinal D'Aragon in 1516." (Page 158, Vol. II.)

To show that there were two versions of this subject Leonardo himself refers to two portraits in his letter to Marshal de Chaumont in the following words: "E portari con mecho due quadri di due Nosstre Donne di varie grandezze le quale son fatte pel cristianissimo re."

Mrs. Heaton says in "Leonardo and His Works" that "Francesco del Gioconda, the husband of Mona Lisa, does not seem to have commissioned the portrait; at least it remained with the painter until he sold it to the French King for 4,000 gold crowns, an enormous sum at that time." Therefore, as there were two portraits mentioned by Leonardo himself, it may be very reasonably supposed that one or more replicas were produced, as was usual in artists' studios of the period, and that it was not necessarily the original which the King purchased from the master.

This is what Vasari himself says of the effect of the picture: "In this portrait of Leonardo's, on the contrary, there is so pleasing an expression and the smile so sweet that while looking at it one thinks it rather divine than human, and it has ever been esteemed a wonderful look, since life itself could exhibit no other appearance."

This can hardly be said about the Louvre picture, in which the expression has been variously described as enigmatic and enchantingly diabolical, and which Michelet, the French historian, said fascinated him as the serpent does the bird. The expression of this newly discovered work is described as serene and sublime.

It has hitherto been generally stated that the pedigree of the Paris picture is known beyond question and that it never left the palaces of Fontainebleau and Versailles until it was placed in the Louvre. For instance, M. A. Gruyet, in the *Gazette des Beaux Arts* in 1887, says: "Il entre dans le Cabinet dore de Fontainebleau ou le pere Dan le trouve encore en 1642. Louis XIV. le transporte a Versailles, ou Bailly le signale dans la 'Petite Galerie du Roy' en 1709. La Revolution le fait venir a Paris et le place au Musee National. De nos jours, enfin, il prend, dans le salon carre la place qu'il occupe aujourdhui."

But against this we have the unquestionable record of Richardson, the old English painter, in his "account of statues, bas-reliefs and drawings in Italy, France, &c.," published in London, 1754. At page 15 he actually describes the French King's pictures as being in Coypel's house! Moreover, that all is not clear regarding the custody of the King's pictures is established on the authority of Lomazzo, who says that he saw Da Vinci's "Leda and Swan" with the "Mona Lisa" at Fontainebleau; but the "Leda" has completely disappeared. Under the entry referring to Da Vinci he says:

"The Jocunda is spoken of at large by Vasari in the life of this master. I considered it with the utmost attention, Landskip, and every part, and find it the same as my father's in every respect, the same particularly in the coloring of the hands as distinguished so that at that distance I could remember no difference, nor can I tell which I should choose."

Are these two pictures those referred to in the words of Fra Pietro da Nuvolaria quoted above? It is declared that the secretary of the King's gallery admitted to Richardson that many experts had doubted the authenticity of the "Mona Lisa" in the gallery. Any one familiar with Richardson's works will not question for an instant the high standard of connoisseurship to which he had attained. They evidence an exceptional insight and knowledge of the works of the old masters.

The above particulars will further intensify the mystery surrounding the portrait of Mona Lisa and fully appreciated by Browning in the following quotation from the "Ring and the Book:"

Oh! with a Lionard going cheap.
If it should prove, as promised, that Jaconde
Whereof a copy contents the Louvre.

A study in the Louvre, by Raphael, from Da Vinci's original "Mona Lisa."

Florida's Razorbacks

"THERE are razorback hogs and razorback hogs," said a New York man who owns up to having spent a winter in the wayback woods of Florida, "but the only true, genuine, hollow ground, keen edged razorback hog is the one that roams and roots the dim lit aisles of those Florida woods, making them look like the streets of New York in their perennial process of being improved. That Florida razorback is a dream, the kind of dream that might follow the trail of the Welsh rabbit, mince pie and lobster taken just before turning in for the night.

"I mind me of one fine specimen of razorback hog which was a source of much pride to the folk down there as establishing a precedent in the possibilities of razorback breeding for physical dimension and proportion as well as heft. This particular one was an inveterate hunter after hens' eggs. The instant he'd hear a hen give herself away by raising a cackle he'd make for the hayshed, in the mow of which the hens found favorite nooks for their nests, and if she wasn't watched mighty close he'd mount the ladder leading up into the mow and scramble that new laid egg in short order.

"One day—this on the assurance of my host, 'a venerable and exemplary citizen of that environment of utter unsophistication—this hog responded to the cackle of a hen and raided her nest in the mow, as it was supposed. At any rate attention was by and by drawn to the razorback by a particularly shrill and unusual squealing which the pig did not seem to be inclined to let up on in the slightest. Then somebody went out to the hayshed to see what ailed the critter.

"It could be heard but not seen, and at last it was located as being somewhere in the space between the outer and the inner clapboarding of the shed. Siding was torn away enough to release the pig, which was standing square on its feet on the sill. The joists, on the inner and outer sides of which the clapboards were nailed, were four inches wide. That made the space where the pig was standing four inches wide. You can figure up yourself how thick through the pig must have been. And that razorback was reckoned to be in the very pink of condition.

"The razorback of that sylvan close forages on the bitter wild oranges that grow abundantly therein and on the pulpy roots of the marsh grass. What the razorback does with all the wild oranges he eats is one of the mysteries of nature.

"If there is one orange on the ground he will eat that. If there are twenty oranges he will eat them. If there is a peck he will eat that. If there is a bushel he will eat the bushel. If there are enough to fill a barrel he will eat them.

"If a wagon load should be lying under a tree he will eat the wagon load. He will eat wild oranges twenty-four hours at a stretch, and yet you would swear that he hadn't had a thing to eat for a month, and you'd feel sorry for him.

"They told me down there that the wild oranges give the razorback pork its flavor and the marsh grass roots give it its fat. Fat! Why, say! If there ever was an unknown quantity it is Florida razorback hog fat! You can't put fat on one of those hogs any more than you can fatten a sawhorse!

"When I first went down there and saw two feet of snout followed by about a foot and a half of hog I wondered, but when I saw a razorback pasturing on the marsh grass I wondered no longer. The hogs go down to the bayou and river shores when the tide is out to yank the tough, rank grass up by the roots. They stay there pasturing, and by and by the tide begins to come in again. Then it's a heap of fun to watch 'em.

"When the water comes in they don't move back out of its way and feed. They stay right in their tracks. The tide comes on in and the razorback continues yanking out marsh grass roots.

"The water reaches his snout, but he doesn't move. He keeps one little black eye out on the advancing tide and the other one is turned on the feeding ground. That may seem to be a physical impossibility, and it would be for anything else besides a Florida razorback hog. He can do it, and does do it.

"Now you see what his long snout is for. The water will come up and be nearly over his back, but his snout has several inches to be covered yet, and he keeps on yanking. When the water gets up to his eyes he gives a disgusted submarine snort that makes the spray fly and seeks dry land and wild oranges.

"The Florida razorback is a natural pacer. He never trots or runs. He paces, and when he lets himself out there isn't a dog in these woods that can catch him.

"I saw a big hog, untrained, and brought right from eating four bushels of wild oranges, pace three straight mile heats and the slowest time he made was 2:32. I believe if they would train those hogs to their gait they could get 'em down to .. two minute record. I'd like to have you go down in that part of Florida some time and ask questions of the simple natives about their razorback hogs. I really do believe you would be surprised, and maybe incredulous."

The "Mona Lisa" recently returned to the Louvre.

Running Municipal Ferries a Costly Operation for Father Knickerbocker

WOULD New York be better served if its transportation systems were operated by the municipality rather than by private corporation? Would the service be as popular? Would the cost of operation be as economical? Some light on these questions is shed by the results of municipal operation of ferries for the last eight years. The municipal ferries are operated between South Ferry and St. George, Staten Island, and between South Ferry and Thirty-ninth street, South Brooklyn.

Up to the close of the year 1912 New York was out of pocket $15,354,257.02 through its operation of a ferry system. The Staten Island division began running October 25, 1905, and the South Brooklyn division November 1, 1906. In the seven years of the one and the six years of the other the city has spent on ferries the considerable sum set down above.

As an offset it possesses ten ferryboats, valued in the aggregate at $2,427,175 in the 1912 report, as well as terminal ferry houses and property in St. George, South Brooklyn and Stapleton. The value of boats and property and franchises is estimated at $5,000,000. Deducting this from $15,354,257.02 and it appears the city spent $10,000,000 in seven years, or about $1,428,000 yearly, to engage in the ferry business.

Why don't the ferries pay? The boats are jammed during the commission hours night and morning, and from the middle of May to the middle of September they are the crowded excursion craft of tens of thousands daily who can afford but a nickel ride. Many of the boat couldn't carry more passengers than they do, and if this isn't an indication of profitable business, what is? And so it would seem. The revenue figures loom up well too. Here are the receipts for the year 1912, as shown in the report of the Department of Docks and Ferries:

STATEN ISLAND DIVISION.

Passenger traffic, $604,629.10.
Vehicle traffic, $160,692.01
Privileges of the boats and terminals, $73,275.17.
Total revenue, $790,885.62.

SOUTH BROOKLYN DIVISION.

Passenger traffic, $74,005.97.
Vehicle traffic, $121,820.29.
Privileges on boats and terminals, $5,294.23.
Total revenue, $201,120.49.
Total revenue of the two divisions for 1912, $992,006.11.

For the same year the following sums were expended to keep the ferry system going:

SOUTH BROOKLYN DIVISION.

Construction of terminals, $31,459.07.
Construction and purchase of boats, $1,092.61; operation and maintenance, $119,890.88.
Acquired property, $91,482.19.
Total expenditure, $543,924.75.

STATEN ISLAND DIVISION.

Construction of terminals, $109,857.50.
Operation and maintenance, $1,234,438.04.
Total expenditure, $1,344,295.54.
Total expenditure both divisions, $1,888,220.29.

Deducting from this expenditure of $1,888,220.29 the revenue of $992,006.11 for the year there is a deficit of $896,214.18 for 1912. Far from running his ferry at a profit, Father Knickerbocker has to "dig deep" for money to keep his ferries running.

Considering the enterprise aside from the sums paid for terminal construction, purchase of boats and acquisition of property it cost $1,654,328.92 to operate and maintain the plant for the year 1912, while for the same period the receipts were $992,006.11, leaving between the cost of operation and maintenance and the traffic and privilege revenue a deficit of $662,322.81.

Suppose a private corporation were to take over the municipal ferry plant and determine to run it at a profit? What steps would it take? First, boats, terminals and other property having been acquired, there is no way in which economy can be applied to their mere possession. The slash therefore must be made in the operation and maintenance of the plant.

How about the number of employees and their salaries? The private corporation would undoubtedly decide to reduce the number of employees and cut their salaries if it can be done. This is what they say about it in the municipal ferry bureau:

"The men employed upon the ferryboats are paid better than men holding similar positions on boats operated by private corporations. They also work but eight hours a day, which is the law. You might cut their salaries and you might increase their hours. You cannot reduce the number of men assigned to each boat. Their number is fixed by United States officials and is proportionate to the class of boat and its cubic foot measurements.

"You might change the time table so as not to run the boats all night, or otherwise manipulate it so as to pull a boat or two off for an entire eight hour shift and thus save one or two crews, or the crews might be changed into, say, ten hour shifts. All of these things could be done and might be done by the private corporation in its determination to make the system profitable.

"Now suppose you try stopping the ferry after midnight, or from, say, 1 A. M. to 5 A. M. or 6 A. M. You cut off a borough of New York from the other boroughs of the municipal body. For five or six hours you cannot get from one section of the city to another. Such a proceeding would cause an exodus from Richmond and a mighty roar of disapproval from real estate centres. A private corporation in its hunt for profits would hardly do this. It might make the intervals between all night trips one or two hours, but even private corporations try to build up a traffic.

"A number of years ago, when the Staten Island ferry was run by a private corporation, there was a last boat every night about midnight. If a graphophone had a cold storage record of what was said every night when the belated Staten Islander missed that boat and had to seek a hotel! The progress of the island was retarded materially because of such a handicapping time table.

"How about cutting the salaries of the men? You could do it, but there is not the slightest doubt the service would suffer. Every man employed on the boats of the system is a civil service man. Think that over for a moment. He has to be of a grade of intelligence that will carry him successfully through an examination proving his fitness.

"Compare the condition of the municipal ferryboats with those of many other lines plying the harbor. Compare the regularity of schedule performance with that of other lines operated by private corporations.

"Another mighty important thing. Suppose users of the system are nearly a unit in demanding some change or innovation for their convenience. Is there any doubt they can get it under the present system? Could they be assured of getting it under a private corporation management? The chances would be against it if it cut into the profits."

Summed up the argument is that New York gives a better service to the users of its municipal ferry than would be given by a private corporation, but it is paying heavily for the service.

One of the chief reasons for the big deficit in the seven year aggregate is the initial expenditure for the boats. No finer craft of their kind are afloat. The value of the Manhattan, Bronx, Queens, Richmond and Brooklyn at the close of 1912 was fixed at $309,782.50 each. Four years before they were valued at $264,450 each. The Stapleton and Castleton at the close of 1912 were valued at $167,875 each. Four years before the value was $187,500 each. The Bay Ridge, Nassau and Gowanus at the end of 1912 were valued at $180,837.50. Their value four years before was $212,750 each.

The Staten Island fleet alone cost over $1,500,000. Was it good business to sink this sum at the start? Would a private corporation have built such expensive boats until it saw profits clearly in sight? Would it not have built smaller boats, selling them later and constructing larger ones, according to the march of the profits? This is one statement they make:

"The municipal ferry system was not established for a day or a year. Large as our boats are—carrying nearly 3,000 at their full capacity—they are crowded for months in the summer. Of what use would smaller boats be? We would have to have more of them and this would mean more crews. In this respect—that of crews—the large boat is much more economical than two or three smaller ones.

The deficit of 1912 was $896,214.18. Measured by a five cent fare, it would take 179,242 more passengers in one year—not considering vehicle traffic or privileges sold—to make up the amount the city was out. The total revenue for 1912 is given at 99,920.05, or what would represent 198,401 passengers. Figuring by months, the deficit for 1912 amounts to what the revenues equalled in ten months. In other words, the revenue must double for a period of ten months to make up the deficit. There must be a 90 per cent. increase.

How long will it take to attain this increase? The total revenue of 1906 (the first full year), was $828,256.52. The total revenue of 1912 was $992,006.11. The increase of revenue for six years in the past was 6 per cent. How many years will it take, measured by present methods and conditions, to catch up with the 90 per cent. deficit?

So there you are, with the same question in closing as at starting. Would New York be better served if its transportation systems were operated by the municipality rather than by the private corporations?